

REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated May 28, 2008 and make the following remarks. No claims have been amended. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 3, 7-10, 14-20, 25-27 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,634 to Kantola et al. (hereinafter "Kantola") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0026202 to Aschermann (hereinafter "Aschermann"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The invention defined by independent claim 1 is a router apparatus wherein routing information of a first unit is mirrored to a second unit in real time. Specifically, at least one of the first unit and second unit comprises at least one switching unit for transferring the routing information from the first unit to the second unit. Moreover, the mirrored routing information is transferred along one path from a first switching unit of the first unit directly to a second switching unit of the second unit.

A similar apparatus is not disclosed in Kantola. There is no disclosure in Kantola of a first unit having a first switching unit and a second unit having a second switching unit such that mirrored routing information is transferred from the first switching unit to the second switching unit.

On page 3 of the present Office Action, the examiner asserts that Kantola teaches a first unit (WO) comprising a switching unit for transferring the routing information from the first unit to the second unit (SP) (column 7, lines 2-8 of Kantola). However, the applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's understanding of Kantola. In column 7, lines 2-8, FIG. 1 of Kantola, a switching element 1 merely switches connections between a first group of transmission channels (L1 to LN) and a second group of transmission channels (L'1 to L'N). The switching element 1 is not housed in, nor does it perform replicating operations in connection with, either of the active unit WO or spare unit SP shown in FIG. 3 of Kantola.

Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that the replicating operation between WO and SP of FIG. 3 generally describes a replicating operation occurring between any two units of a control element 2 shown in FIG. 1. For example, WO and SP may respectively represent any two signaling units 21A - 21E, any two service units 22A - 22D, or any paired combination thereof. Accordingly, because any replicating operation occurs strictly within the control

element 2, it is clear that the switching element 1 is not involved during the replicating process, and therefore has no connection with either WO or SP, as represented by any two units of the control element 2, with regard to replication. Moreover, it is submitted that Kantola does not teach or suggest any units (e.g., signaling units 21, service units 22, etc.) of the control element 2 comprising a switching unit for transferring routing information from one unit to another.

In view of this, it is respectfully asserted that claim 1, and the claims dependent thereon, are allowable over Kantola. It is further asserted that Aschermann fails to cure the deficiencies of Kantola with respect to a first unit having a first switching unit and a second unit having a second switching unit such that mirrored routing information is transferred from the first switching unit to the second switching unit, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, and the claims dependent thereon are allowable over the combination of Kantol and Aschermann.

Independent claims 10, 16 and 25 recite limitations similar to independent claim 1. Therefore, in view of the remarks made with respect to claim 1, it is submitted that claims 10, 26 and 25, and the claims respectively dependent thereon, are also allowable over the combination of Kantol and Aschermann.

Claims 22, 23, 24, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantola in view of Aschermann, as applied to claims 21, 22, 25 and 29, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,504 to Saine et al. (hereinafter "Saine"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, independent claims 16 and 25 are allowable over the combination of Kantol and Aschermann. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Saine fails to cure the deficiencies of Kantola and Aschermann with respect to a first unit having a first switching unit and a second unit having a second switching unit such that mirrored routing information is transferred from the first switching unit to the second switching unit, as recited in the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16 and 25 are allowable over Kantola, Aschermann and Saine. Furthermore, by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 16 and 25, it is submitted that claims 22, 23, 24, 29 and 30 are also allowable over the cited references.

Claims 21-24, 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantola in view of Aschermann, as applied to claims 16, 21, 25 and 29, and further in view

of U.S. Patent No. 5,182,801 to Asfour (hereinafter "Asfour"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, independent claims 16 and 25 are allowable over the combination of Kantola and Aschermann. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Asfour fails to cure the deficiencies of Kantola and Aschermann with respect to a first unit having a first switching unit and a second unit having a second switching unit such that mirrored routing information is transferred from the first switching unit to the second switching unit, as recited in the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16 and 25 are allowable over Kantola, Aschermann and Asfour. Furthermore, by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 16 and 25, it is submitted that claims 21-24, 28 and 30 are also allowable over the cited references.

Claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantola in view of Aschermann, as applied to claims 3, 2 and 10, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,169 to Tada (hereinafter "Tada"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the combination of Kantola and Aschermann. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Tada fails to cure the deficiencies of Kantola and Aschermann with respect to a first unit having a first switching unit and a second unit having a second switching unit such that mirrored routing information is transferred from the first switching unit to the second switching unit, as recited in the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Kantola, Aschermann and Tada. Furthermore, by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 1 and 10, it is submitted that claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 are also allowable over the cited references.

Claims 6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantola in view of Aschermann and Tada, as applied to claims 5 and 12, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,012,109 to Schultz (hereinafter "Schultz"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the combination of Kantola, Aschermann and Tada. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Schultz fails to cure the deficiencies of Kantola, Aschermann and Tada with respect to a first unit having a first switching unit and a second unit having a second switching unit such that mirrored routing information is transferred from the first switching unit to the second switching unit, as recited in

the independent claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 10 are allowable over Kantola, Aschermann, Tada and Schultz. Furthermore, by virtue of their respective dependence on claims 1 and 10, it is submitted that claims 6 and 13 are also allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present Response places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: August 27, 2008

By: _____



Lew Edward V. Macapagal, Esq.
Registration No. 55,416
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 035884